

REMARKS

Claims 10-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Particularly, the Office Action states that there does not appear to be a written description of the amended claim features wherein “consisting essentially of” has been replaced with “comprising”, e.g., in claim 10, line 3, “further includes”, as in claim 14, or “further comprises” as in claim 16, in respect to the medium in the application as filed. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the reason that the written description, including the claims, as originally filed supports the claim changes made in Amendment C.

Both the claims and written description as originally filed disclose a medium including significant features in addition to those defined in originally-filed claim 10. For example, amended claim 10 defines, among other features, a medium that before writing comprises a host matrix containing a liquid monomer and a dye. Though claim 10 as originally filed defines at least a medium “consisting essentially of” a host matrix containing a liquid monomer and a dye, dependent claim 12 as originally filed defines a medium “further including” an inhibitor. As recognized by the Examiner, the term “including” is open-ended, and thus describes a medium having one or more additional features. Further, because claim 12 itself introduces an additional substantial element to those in claim 10, this contradicts the proposition that the medium of claim 10 as originally filed could not have additional significant features. Accordingly, claim 12 as originally filed provides support for a medium as defined in amended claim 10.

The originally-filed specification beyond the claims provides further support for a medium having significant features besides a host matrix containing a liquid monomer and a dye. For example, the specification discloses, for a medium, embodiments including the presence of, among other things, inhibitor molecules in a photopolymer (e.g., see page 3, lines 4-5, page 8, lines 11-16, page 23, lines 2-6), a binder, which contains the photopolymer and the dye (page 4, lines 18-19, page 6, lines 6-9, page 7, lines 6-11), additional photoinitiators (though the dye itself in certain embodiments may be used as the photoinitiator, e.g., page 4, line 30 – page 5, line 1, page 6, lines 25-26), and/or a crosslinker (page 27, lines 10-14). Further, though the specification describes a composition of matter that “consists essentially of” a monomer and a dye, the specification also states that the composition of matter may “further include” a binder (page 5, lines 19-27). As another example, a dye group described in the specification is stated to “consist essentially of” Rhodamine B and/or Bodipy Red, but it may still be “permissively drawn from a large group” (page 8, lines 27-29). Further, a host matrix may “contain” (an open-ended term) a photopolymer and a dye that photoinitiates polymerization (page 9, lines 11-14). Thus, the specification separately provides support for claim 10 as amended.

The Office Action rejects claim 14 for the addition of the language “further includes”. Claim 14 as originally filed defines that the host matrix “consists essentially of” binder and solvent. However, independent claim 10 defines, among other things, that a host matrix “contains” a liquid monomer and a dye. Accordingly, support exists for the

host matrix to include more than the binder and solvent defined in claim 14, both from the additional features of the host matrix defined in claim 12 (the monomer and dye) and from the use of the open-ended term “contains” in originally-filed claim 10. Thus, the amendment to claim 14 is also supported by the application as filed.


The Office Action rejects claim 16 due to the phrase “host matrix further comprises”. However, claim 16 depends from independent claim 10, which defines, among other things, a host matrix “containing” a liquid monomer and a dye. This provides support for open-ended features, including the possible addition of features. Applicants note that claim 16 as originally filed defines, among other things, that the photopolymer (not the host matrix) “consists essentially of” a monomer, a crosslinker, an initiator, and a photosensitizer, but the monomer was already defined in claim 10, which is one reason Applicants amended this claim.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to claims 10-24 in Amendment C are supported by the application as originally filed, and that claims 10-24 comply with the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. As the Examiner has indicated that all previous rejections have been overcome by Applicants’ amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10-24 are allowable, and their allowance is respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner should call Applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Arik B. Ranson
Registration No. 43,874

Customer No. 24978

January 3, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive

Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: (312) 360-0080

Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\0321\67680\679753.DOC